

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-16 are pending in the subject application.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 15, and 16, and has canceled claim 2. The changes to these claims do not introduce any new matter.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Matsuda et al.* ("Matsuda") (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133573 A1). As will be explained in more detail below, the *Matsuda* reference does not disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1, 15, and 16, as amended herein.

The *Matsuda* reference discloses an example of general network booting. In the case of general network booting, configuration information is obtained from a DHCP server for each booting, which makes it unnecessary to store the configuration information in a memory, and stored configuration information is never used to independently boot up the network.

To distinguish the claimed subject matter from that shown by the *Matsuda* reference, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to specify that the update module "selects the setting information mapped to the predetermined identification information for identifying said network device among the received setting information, when the received setting information includes setting information mapped to identification information allocated to another network device and updates a storage in the setting information memory module, based on the received or selected setting information." In light of the changes made to claim 1, Applicant has canceled claim 2. Applicant has amended independent claims 15 and 16 along the same lines that claim 1 has been amended (except that amended claim 16 does not specify selected setting information).

The network device defined in amended claim 1 uses identification information to select appropriate setting information that corresponds to each of the network devices, when the setting information includes setting information of the multiple network devices. This configuration is capable of reducing the load imposed on the information processing device that provides the setting information.

In the claimed configuration, if the information processing device provides setting information, which is the logical sum of setting information corresponding to multiple network devices, each of the network devices selects and obtains appropriate setting information that corresponds to its own identification information. With this configuration, the information processing device does not have to respond individually to respective network devices. As such, this configuration enables the information processing device to easily manage a number of clients while preventing the load imposed on it from increasing.

On the other hand, networking booting does not involve selecting appropriate configuration information from among configuration information for multiple network devices, and the *Matsuda* reference does not disclose (or suggest) the selection of configuration information as in the claimed subject matter. The *Matsuda* reference mentions changing the network name and updating the user information; however, either of these operations is carried out on the server side.

In summary, the *Matsuda* reference fails to disclose (or suggest) storing configuration information in a memory and updating the storage content each time new configuration information is received as in the claimed subject matter.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1, 15, and 16, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Matsuda*. Claims 3-9, 11, and 14, each of which ultimately depends from claim 1, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Matsuda* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matsuda* in view of *Traversat et al.* (“*Traversat*”) (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,157). As noted above, Applicant has canceled claim 2 because the features specified therein have been added to independent claims 1, 15, and 16. To the extent that the rejection of claim 2 may be deemed to apply to claim 1, as amended herein, Applicant responds as follows.

In support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner alleges that the *Traversat* reference discloses an update module that “selects the setting information mapped to the predetermined identification information for identifying said network device among the received setting information, when the received setting information includes setting information mapped to identification information allocated to another network device (Col. 13, ln. 64 – Col. 14, ln. 1-9).” Office Action at pages 5-6. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s characterization of the cited portion of the *Traversat* reference relative to the claimed subject matter.

The cited portion of the *Traversat* reference merely discloses that a server broadcasts an update or a change to appropriate clients. In this process, the server selects appropriate clients (by determining which applications might be affected by the update) and the clients themselves do not make any selection regarding an update module. Thus, even if the *Matsuda* and *Traversat* references were to be combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the combination would not have resulted in the claimed subject matter, as defined in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Matsuda* in view of *Traversat*.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matsuda* in view of *Parthesarathy et al.* (“*Parthesarathy*”) (U.S. Patent No. US 6,353,926 B1). Claim 10 ultimately depends from claim 1. The *Parthesarathy* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the *Matsuda* reference relative to the subject matter defined in amended claim 1. Accordingly, claim 10 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Matsuda* in view of *Parthesarathy* for at least the reason that this claim depends from claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matsuda* in view of *Sherer et al.* (“*Sherer*”) (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,376). Claims 12 and 13 ultimately depend from claim 1. The *Sherer* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the *Matsuda* reference relative to the subject matter defined in amended claim 1. Accordingly, claims 12 and 13 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Matsuda* in view of *Sherer* for at least the reason that these claims depend from claim 1.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reexamination and reconsideration of claims 1 and 3-16, as amended herein, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any fees are due in connection

**Application No. 10/632,763  
Amendment dated May 29, 2007  
Response to Office Action dated February 28, 2007**

with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to  
Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP044).

Respectfully submitted,  
**MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP**



Peter B. Martine  
Registration No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
**Customer No. 25920**